

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's allowance of Claims 39, 41, 43, 44, 46, 48, 49, 51, 53, 57-65 and 69-83. Applicant also appreciates the Examiner's time and suggestions during the interview of June 7, 2007.

Except as specifically explained below, Applicant is amending the claims to correct informalities therein and not in response to a patentability rejection.

Applicant will now address the Examiner's remaining rejections in the Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 24, 25, 28, 54, 84, 86 and 87 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zaleski (US 5,455,791) in view of Brotherton (U.S. 5,488,001), and rejects Claims 29, 30, 33-35, 38, 55 and 56 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zaleski together with Brotherton and Liu et al. (U.S. 5,814,854). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

While Applicant traverses these rejections, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant is amending independent Claims 24, 29 and 34 to recite the features of "a pair of first impurity regions being formed in the semiconductor substrate;" "an active region formed between the pair of first impurity regions in the semiconductor substrate;" and "at least two second impurity regions formed in said semiconductor substrate between the pair of first impurity regions." Support for these features can be found, for example, at page 6, line 25 - page 7, line 18 of the specification and Figs. 1A-1D of the present application. Hence, no new matter is being added, and it is respectfully requested that these amendments be entered and allowed.

In contrast, neither Zaleski, Brotherton, nor Liu discloses or suggests these claimed features.

Hence, independent Claims 24, 29 and 34 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claims 24, 29 and 34 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over these references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of these claims be withdrawn.

With regard to independent Claim 84, Applicant is amending this claim to recite the features of “a crystalline semiconductor film formed on the oxide film, including a source region, a channel forming region, and a drain region;” and “three impurity regions formed along the channel length direction respectively.” Dependent Claim 85 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Support for these claimed features can be found, for example, at page 19, line 16 - page 20, line 18 of the specification and Figs. 6A-6D of the present application. Hence, no new matter is being added, and it is respectfully requested that these amendments be entered and allowed.

In contrast, neither Zaleski, Brotherton, nor Liu discloses or suggests these claimed features.

Hence, independent Claim 84 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claim 84 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over these references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of these claims be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee is due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: August 20, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/

Mark J. Murphy

Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, MCFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street - Ste. 2850
Chicago, IL 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568